

**Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.**

MEETING

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD

MARKET DEVELOPMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE

JOE SERNA JR., CALEPA HEADQUARTERS BUILDING

1001 I STREET

COASTAL HEARING ROOM

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 2008

1:40 P.M.

JAMES F. PETERS, CSR, RPR  
CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER  
LICENSE NUMBER 10063

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

**Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.**

ii

APPEARANCES

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Mr. Gary Petersen, Chairperson

Ms. Margo Reid Brown

Mr. Wesley Chesbro

STAFF

Mr. Mark Leary, Executive Director

Mr. Elliot Block, Chief Counsel

Ms. Janelle Auyeung, Knowledge Integration Branch

Mr. Howard Levenson, Director, Local Jurisdiction, State  
Agency & Business Assistance Program

ALSO PRESENT

Mr. Arthur Boone, Northern California Recycling  
Association

Mr. George Eowan, California Refuse Removal Council

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

**Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.**

iii

INDEX

	PAGE
Roll Call And Declaration Of Quorum	1
Public Comment	2
A. Program Directors' Report	5
B. Consideration Of Contractor For the Cost Study On Commercial Recycling (Integrated Waste Management Account, FY 2008/09)	6
Motion	19
Vote	19
Adjournment	21
Reporter's Certificate	22

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Okay. Good afternoon.

3 And welcome to the California Integrated Waste Management  
4 Board Market Development and Sustainability Committee  
5 meeting.

6 Out of courtesy, please shut your phones off.

7 Victoria, could you call the roll, please.

8 COMMITTEE SECRETARY CARVAJAL: Brown?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: Here.

10 COMMITTEE SECRETARY CARVAJAL: Chesbro?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER CHESBRO: Here.

12 COMMITTEE SECRETARY CARVAJAL: Chair Petersen?

13 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Here.

14 Are we all up to date on our ex partes?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: I am up to date.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER CHESBRO: I think so.

17 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Very good.

18 Okay. And it's just us. This is a biggy here.

19 Speaker requests are at the back of the room.

20 And bring them up to Victoria if you've got something to  
21 say.

22 Is there anyone who wishes to address the

23 Committee on what's not on our agenda today?

24 Art Boone.

25 Arthur.

1           MR. BOONE: Arthur Boone from the Northern  
2 California Recycling Association. I would have rather  
3 done this tomorrow during a full Board meeting, but I  
4 can't come tomorrow, so I wanted to tell you what's  
5 happening today about this subject.

6           Our Association has been involved in litigation  
7 with Solano County for a number of years about the  
8 permitting and expansion of the Solano County landfill,  
9 the Potrero Hills Landfill. And about less than a month  
10 ago, the Superior Court ruled in our favor on an issue  
11 which we think is of great importance to local governments  
12 in California.

13           What the people of Solano County did in 1984 was  
14 they enacted an ordinance, which essentially would  
15 prohibit the importation of large quantities of garbage  
16 from out of the county. That was defined as about a  
17 hundred thousand tons a year.

18           The county counsel basically decided that was not  
19 enforceable under various Supreme Court decisions, which  
20 allowed the free movement of garbage around.

21           That particular ordinance has never been  
22 challenged. And we have a separate case which I want to  
23 make sure you understand is different from the permitting  
24 of the expansion of Potrero's landfill. And that case  
25 will go to trial some time next year -- middle of next

1 year. We're in the middle of discovery on that.

2 But the old case, the case that's been around for  
3 about three years, what the judge said was essentially  
4 that when the county gave the Hay Road Landfill a permit  
5 to take in as much garbage as the county needed for the  
6 next 15 years, that is what the county had to do under the  
7 State law. The state -- the county is not required to  
8 give Potrero Hills an expansion permit, because they want  
9 a permit or because they collect a lot of garbage in  
10 Solano County. The State -- the county is required - this  
11 is a judge's holding, and you're welcome to read this,  
12 make sure you understand it - is that if the county has  
13 permitted that much space for its own garbage, that's all  
14 the law requires of the county. If the county wants to do  
15 more, it can, presumably. But if it doesn't, then it  
16 doesn't have to.

17 And we think this is a very important decision.  
18 The judge essentially sent it back to the parties to see  
19 if they could work out something. Essentially, a lot of  
20 the public's collected garbage would end up at a NorCal  
21 dump. But the question -- we've always felt that the  
22 Potrero Hills was never the right place to put garbage.  
23 And as you know, the law's very complicated. BCDC's  
24 involved. It's a very complicated case.

25 But the simple holding in this case is that if

1 the county has already got enough capacity for its own  
2 garbage for 15 more years, why do we have to junk up  
3 another space?

4           And I think the Court really understood that  
5 garbage really is a pollutant. It's not something that we  
6 want next to us, around us. It's a least desirable  
7 alternative. And, therefore, to have the county off the  
8 hook, essentially, to permit an expansion of this  
9 landfill, because the county has already allowed another  
10 company that much space, that should be good enough.

11           And so it will be interesting to see how this  
12 case comes out. It will probably end up in the Supreme  
13 Court eventually in this state, maybe in the United  
14 States.

15           The other case, which has to do with Measure E,  
16 where the people of Solano County 20 years ago said, "We  
17 don't want to be junked up with garbage from out of  
18 county." Eighty-five percent of the garbage coming into  
19 Potrero Hills Landfill now is from out of county. But  
20 that's another case that's -- you know, I just want to  
21 make sure you keep those separate.

22           But we think this is a very important development  
23 in the law. We're very proud to be litigants in that  
24 matter. And we think we're protecting the resources of  
25 the state for all the people.

1 Thank you.

2 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Great. Thank you.

3 Okay. Howard, do we have a report this  
4 afternoon?

5 LOCAL JURISDICTION, STATE AGENCY & BUSINESS

6 ASSISTANCE PROGRAM DIRECTOR LEVENSON: Thank you, Madam --  
7 Mr. Chair. Howard Levenson --

8 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: I'll be Madam Chair.  
9 That's good.

10 LOCAL JURISDICTION, STATE AGENCY & BUSINESS

11 ASSISTANCE PROGRAM DIRECTOR LEVENSON: Madam Chair, yeah.

12 (Laughter.)

13 LOCAL JURISDICTION, STATE AGENCY & BUSINESS

14 ASSISTANCE PROGRAM DIRECTOR LEVENSON: Howard Levenson --

15 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: I'm going to get you for  
16 that.

17 LOCAL JURISDICTION, STATE AGENCY & BUSINESS

18 ASSISTANCE PROGRAM DIRECTOR LEVENSON: I used to be with  
19 the Sustainability Program but --

20 (Laughter.)

21 LOCAL JURISDICTION, STATE AGENCY & BUSINESS

22 ASSISTANCE PROGRAM DIRECTOR LEVENSON: I don't have a  
23 report beyond what I mentioned on Monday, except to say  
24 that with the pharmaceutical item and all the discussion  
25 that we have, we have secured a room for the stakeholders'



1 meeting. It will be December 19th, which is a Friday  
2 afternoon. But we'll get that word out today or tomorrow  
3 and make arrangements accordingly. So following up on  
4 your direction from that meeting.

5 Other than that, we're ready to proceed with our  
6 lengthy agenda.

7 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Oh, yeah. Fire away.  
8 Let's go.

9 LOCAL JURISDICTION, STATE AGENCY & BUSINESS

10 ASSISTANCE PROGRAM DIRECTOR LEVENSON: Okay. Item 6 for  
11 the Board is Consideration of a Contractor for the Cost  
12 Study on Commercial Recycling. Of course, as we discussed  
13 on Monday, one of the key components of being able to  
14 enact any recycling -- commercial recycling strategy is  
15 that we need to have better information on costs and cost  
16 savings.

17 The Board had very extensive input into this  
18 scope of work back at our February meeting, and then we  
19 came back in June with the scope of work. So we  
20 appreciate that input and we're very pleased to bring this  
21 to you for your consideration.

22 So I'll turn it over to Janelle Auyeung, who will  
23 make the presentation for you today.

24 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Okay. Good afternoon,  
25 Janelle.

1 MS. AUYEUNG: Good afternoon, Committee Chair  
2 Peterson and Committee members.

3 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: You want to scoot closer.

4 MS. AUYEUNG: The mic is on.

5 Okay?

6 LOCAL JURISDICTION, STATE AGENCY & BUSINESS

7 ASSISTANCE PROGRAM DIRECTOR LEVENSON: There you go.

8 MS. AUYEUNG: My name is Janelle Auyeung from the  
9 Sustainability Program.

10 And at the June 17th, 2008, Board meeting, the  
11 Board approved the scope of work for this project and also  
12 the financing and scoring criteria. This contract will  
13 accomplish two major objectives:

14 The first one is to estimate the incremental  
15 costs for -- incremental costs by geographical region to  
16 recycle targeted material from large commercial sources.

17 The second objective is to develop an online tool  
18 that allows individual businesses to use to estimate costs  
19 and potential GHG cost savings data based on the cost data  
20 collected from the first objective.

21 Due to the specialized expertise needed for this  
22 project, the Board directed staff to do a secondary  
23 Request For Proposal. The Board staff followed Board  
24 procedure for our contracting process by circulating the  
25 public RFP announcement on the web and we also sent out

1 individual notices to over 100 firms that are in the  
2 contract database.

3           Three firms submitted their proposals by the  
4 deadline. These proposals have been reviewed by a panel  
5 of five board staff together. The proposal that received  
6 the highest score is HF&F Consultants, with a bid amount  
7 of \$348,330.

8           We ask the Committee to approve the proposed  
9 contractor and adopt the revised Resolution 2008-178.

10           This concludes my presentation. Thank you.

11           CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Great. Thank you.

12           We have one speaker on this item before we have a  
13 questions from Committee.

14           Arthur.

15           MR. BOONE: Arthur Boone again for the Northern  
16 California Recycling Association.

17           I think Wesley would remember. I'm not sure the  
18 rest of you would. The original language of AB 939 asked  
19 the cities to figure out what the recycling rates were per  
20 city. And the original language as it was -- as it came  
21 out on the Legislature was that the cities were supposed  
22 to go out and do this. Two years later they came back and  
23 they said to the Legislature and to this Board that they  
24 couldn't do it. It was very, very complicated because  
25 people didn't want to collaborate, didn't want to assist

1 them. And so what we now call the Tsang formula, Tsang  
2 formula basically was the compromise or the second  
3 generation of how good do we measure all of this kind of  
4 stuff.

5           And the basic problem is that the private sector  
6 does not want to collaborate. State of Florida and the  
7 State of Oregon have both spent a lot of time and a lot of  
8 money trying to figure out what California doesn't know,  
9 which is how many tons of cardboard do we recycle, how  
10 many tons of newspaper, all that kind of stuff. We know  
11 what's in the garbage, because we count that. But when we  
12 try to figure out what's in the diversion stream, we don't  
13 really know, because we haven't taken the time to do the  
14 counting.

15           Okay. My impression is that this study, because  
16 it doesn't have really high level background and support,  
17 is going to have the same problem that we had in 1992,  
18 which is -- Wesley raised this question in June at the  
19 Board meeting. I think you raised the question in the  
20 advisory committee. But my prediction is that the data  
21 you're going to get out of this is not going to be very  
22 usable, because a lot of people aren't going to  
23 collaborate. And so that's one problem.

24           The other problem is that most of the recycling  
25 in this state is actually done by people and by businesses

1 that are not under the solid waste franchise system.  
2 They're done by independent packers, independent haulers,  
3 independent people who basically try to dodge local  
4 government as much as possible. And even after 15 years  
5 if somebody says, "I've got a pile of cardboard" and they  
6 call the City of Oakland and the City of San Francisco and  
7 say, "Can you send me a pickup truck that will pick this  
8 stuff up," the city doesn't know how to link up to those  
9 private sector service providers.

10           It's really sad to me. I was such a provider for  
11 a period of time. And the idea that we couldn't somehow  
12 figure a way to get all this information around so that a  
13 guy like me who's trying to make money with a pickup truck  
14 could get some help from the city, just information stuff.  
15 Never happened.

16           So I think we have a -- again, have a major  
17 project. I don't think this proposal has enough juice  
18 behind it in terms of the staff is not going to be able to  
19 talk to the contractor, the contractor's not going to be  
20 able to talk to the haulers and to the private sector to  
21 get any kind of useful information. That's my opinion. I  
22 don't know exactly what to do. But I'm sorry I didn't  
23 express it earlier. But that's my opinion. Thank you --  
24 our opinion.

25           CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Thank you, Arthur.

1 Any comments, questions?

2 Howard, do you want to respond?

3 LOCAL JURISDICTION, STATE AGENCY & BUSINESS

4 ASSISTANCE PROGRAM DIRECTOR LEVENSON: I'd be happy to.

5 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: And then I have something  
6 to tell you.

7 LOCAL JURISDICTION, STATE AGENCY & BUSINESS

8 ASSISTANCE PROGRAM DIRECTOR LEVENSON: Do you want to go  
9 first?

10 (Laughter.)

11 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: No, you go ahead.

12 LOCAL JURISDICTION, STATE AGENCY & BUSINESS

13 ASSISTANCE PROGRAM DIRECTOR LEVENSON: Well, I appreciate  
14 Mr. Boone's opinion.

15 A couple of comments back.

16 First of all, the study is not about estimating  
17 diversion. It's about trying to obtain cost information  
18 about commercial recycling, so that we can provide a  
19 better basis for decisions that the Board will have to  
20 make in the future about the commercial recycling measure  
21 in the scoping plan.

22 I think we all understand how difficult it is to  
23 get that kind of data. We are going to have to work with  
24 the contractor through your offices and other avenues to  
25 try and get some information on the range of costs

1 associated with commercial recycling. Probably that's  
2 going to involve some masking of information. No  
3 question, it's going to be difficult. But we do not have  
4 the information we need in order to move forward on some  
5 of the future considerations for commercial recycling.  
6 And so we need to try this. I think we've constructed it  
7 in as best a way we can, recognizing those barriers or  
8 those issues.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: As I recall, when we  
10 initially talked about this study needing to be done, we  
11 did recognize -- and Member Mulé was here and, Gary, you  
12 expressed also -- the difficulty that we've had in past  
13 studies and we will have. I think recognizing that  
14 difficulty is at least the first step in crossing that  
15 hurdle.

16 But, you know, commercial recycling is the next  
17 frontier. We've hit 54 percent. We know that that is the  
18 next thing we need to tackle, and I think everybody is  
19 supportive of moving commercial recycling. But in the PSP  
20 we know we need to show its cost effectiveness. And the  
21 only way we're going to be able to do that is to have a  
22 study in part that, you know, shows us some real numbers,  
23 and we can make the argument whether we're supportive of  
24 voluntary measures or mandatory measures. We're going to  
25 have to show the cost effectiveness and what it's going to

1 cost businesses in order to make that argument.

2 So I'm supportive.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER CHESBRO: Well, the part of Mr.  
4 Boone's point that I haven't heard fully addressed -- or  
5 adequately addressed, I think, is whether or not we can  
6 get the data that we need to make this study effective,  
7 even if it's not -- I'm not disagreeing that he was  
8 focusing on something slightly different than what you're  
9 trying to do -- you're proposing that we do, but whether  
10 or not we can get out of the private sector what we need  
11 to make it useful.

12 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Okay. One more here.

13 I agree with Mr. Boone about the difficulties.  
14 I've been there, we've done that. And we did a study for  
15 the State back in 1979 dealing with the private sector,  
16 and I know how difficult it was. We got the information,  
17 but we had to do it the Arthur Anderson way. Well,  
18 they're out of business. Who else is left?

19 (Laughter.)

20 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Anyway --

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: Lehman Brothers? Or are  
22 they gone too?

23 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: More of those guys.

24 But, for me, I think we have enough  
25 sophistication in who we are and what we're doing today,



1 especially with the CRRC members and the big brokers and  
2 dealers, that they know the next frontier is going to be  
3 commercial recycling. However, it's organized, it's going  
4 to happen one way or another. So what I see happening is  
5 is there's going to be some cooperation here and we'll  
6 start again. We'll try it one more time. But we're more  
7 sophisticated than we were ten years ago, five years ago  
8 about getting to the point where we need to get this  
9 information.

10           So I'm very happy about us doing this, and I'm  
11 supportive. And, Howard, my office is available for you  
12 and the team to put this all together. Okay?

13           George, would you like to speak for CRRC on this  
14 at all?

15           You're going to have hurry though. This is a  
16 long Committee meeting. Okay?

17           MR. EOWAN: Yeah, okay.

18           George Eowan for California Refuse Removal  
19 Council.

20           CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: I like that.

21           MR. EOWAN: We'd be happy to work with your  
22 chosen vendor, wherever they are. Are they here?

23           I'd be happy to work with them. Any information  
24 that we could provide you, we'd be happy to provide it. I  
25 haven't really seen the scope of work, so I'm not sure --

1 I know you're after costs and -- the speech I was going to  
2 make today, which I decided not to, because I've been  
3 haranguing everybody so much, is about markets. So, you  
4 know, now it might be worthwhile to look at your scope  
5 again given the costs of commercial and what's going on.  
6 And how that relates to the market situation is going to  
7 be very different than what you might have anticipated  
8 before.

9 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: There's going to be  
10 spillage on this to where we're going and what's  
11 happening. I agree.

12 MR. EOWAN: I was at a meeting yesterday in the  
13 Bay Area, and they asked me, "Well, how long do you think  
14 this is going to last," you know, and --

15 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Nobody knows.

16 MR. EOWAN: No one knows. So I think I would be  
17 more worried about those kinds of issues, sort of the real  
18 effect of all of this and what's going on with all the  
19 material that's being collected and has nowhere to go  
20 right now.

21 The fact that we're dependent on -- here, I am --  
22 this is my real speech -- we're dependent on foreign  
23 markets so much. We need to have more markets here. What  
24 can the Board do about that? And I know you're working on  
25 that, and we're going to be talking about that in the

1 coming months.

2 So, you know, there's a lot of issues around  
3 this. It's not a real clear-cut, you know, cut-and-dry  
4 kind of a thing.

5 My colleague --

6 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: I'm going to ask your help  
7 to help us --

8 MR. EOWAN: I would be happy -- I guess that's  
9 what you'd like me to say.

10 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: That's it.

11 MR. EOWAN: I'd be very happy to do that.

12 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Thank you.

13 MR. EOWAN: Thank you.

14 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: All right. Any other  
15 questions or comments?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER CHESBRO: Well, I sort of asked  
17 a question -- maybe it was rhetorical, but I've noticed a  
18 couple of staff leaning forward towards their microphones  
19 and then -- but I just was looking for assurance on the --  
20 that the question of whether or not we need private sector  
21 cooperation in gathering the data is going to be a problem  
22 or not.

23 LOCAL JURISDICTION, STATE AGENCY & BUSINESS

24 ASSISTANCE PROGRAM DIRECTOR LEVENSON: Well, we're going  
25 to find out. I mean, to be honest, this is -- we know

1 this is going to be an issue. We've tried to get  
2 information in the past, for example, on waste  
3 characterization at MRFs. We've tried to get cost  
4 information in the past. So it's no small task.

5 I think everybody understands though, at least  
6 most of the major players understand, the severity of this  
7 issue -- or the magnitude of this issue and that we need  
8 to have at least a range of cost information. We can mask  
9 that information, you know, make it confidential, a third  
10 party kind of arrangement, so they don't have to divulge  
11 proprietary, you know, market kind of information.

12 But we need to have a much better handle on the  
13 range of costs associated with different kinds of  
14 recycling operations, so that we can then say if we would  
15 voluntarily or mandatorily have a commercial recycling  
16 program for businesses of this size or that size, here's  
17 the range of cost. But I can't tell you with certainty  
18 that it's going to be a smooth sale.

19 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: We'll see. This is going  
20 to -- for me, I see what George was talking about. As we  
21 move through this, you're going to get input from these  
22 people. And whether you like it or not, it's going to  
23 happen. And they're going to tell you, well, maybe we  
24 need to work on infrastructure. Our costs maybe go down  
25 if we had more infrastructure in the State of California,

1 for shipping purposes and all the other things you can  
2 think of.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: Well, and the fact of  
4 the matter is, there's a lot of people out there that are  
5 very supportive of mandatory commercial recycling. And  
6 without supplying the information to make that argument  
7 about cost effectiveness, we're never going to be able to  
8 move mandatory recycling at all. And, you know, we know  
9 that's where we need to go eventually. So, you know, I  
10 would hope that the people that are supportive of it are  
11 going to help supply the information in whatever way,  
12 shape, or form is necessary, because it's in their  
13 interest.

14 LOCAL JURISDICTION, STATE AGENCY & BUSINESS  
15 ASSISTANCE PROGRAM DIRECTOR LEVENSON: Well, I think  
16 certainly we're going to have to have -- once we get past  
17 the initial meetings with the contractor, we're going to  
18 have to have a lot of meetings with stakeholders so that  
19 they help define the process for getting some of the  
20 information and making sure that it's kept confidential  
21 and, you know, provide them assurances. And we'll just do  
22 everything we can to get, you know, a sufficient level of  
23 information.

24 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Great.

25 And this reminds me back when we were doing AB

1 2020, and we had meetings with the recyclers, who were all  
2 mad at me, because we came up with this new system on how  
3 to recycle -- instead of a bottle bill.

4 But then they turned around and realized they  
5 could make money at it because we would build a different  
6 kind of infrastructure and -- there's a lot of different  
7 things that are going to pop out of this.

8 Anyway, I guess is there any other questions or  
9 comments?

10 Otherwise, do I hear a motion?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: I move Resolution  
12 2008-178 revised.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER CHESBRO: Second.

14 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Tracey, could you call the  
15 roll, please.

16 MS. COTTINGIM: Brown?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: Aye.

18 MS. COTTINGIM: Chesbro?

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER CHESBRO: Aye.

20 MS. COTTINGIM: Petersen?

21 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Aye.

22 Okay. There's one last thing I want to do  
23 because this was such a long agenda -- Oh, I'm sorry.  
24 Howard.

25 LOCAL JURISDICTION, STATE AGENCY & BUSINESS

1 ASSISTANCE PROGRAM DIRECTOR LEVENSON: Just make sure that  
2 this is on fiscal consent, please.

3 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Oh, we'll do that too.  
4 Thank you.

5 This is really important though.

6 I want to thank Wesley for serving on the  
7 Committee, being a pal in recycling for the last 35 years.

8 God, we're old --

9 (Laughter.)

10 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: -- you know.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER CHESBRO: I leaned over to Gary  
12 when Art started talking about me knowing about something  
13 in the early nineties. And I said, "Gary, you're older  
14 than I am, aren't you?"

15 (Laughter.)

16 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Very funny.

17 Anyway, I want to thank you for serving on the  
18 Committee and being a friend. And I wish you the best of  
19 luck at what you're going to do. And I'm coming over to  
20 your office to chitchat.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER CHESBRO: Well, it has been  
22 genuinely a privilege, both personally with you, Gary, and  
23 with the other Board members. But also, as I said at the  
24 committee the other day, this is my first love, you know.  
25 And you don't forget your first love.

1 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: And we're not going away.

2 Anyway, I'd like to thank everybody for this long

3 meeting. I'm tired. Time for a nap.

4 (Laughter.)

5 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Thank you, all.

6 (Thereupon the California Integrated Waste

7 Management Board, Market Development and

8 Sustainability Committee meeting adjourned

9 at 2:02 p.m.)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25



1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

2 I, JAMES F. PETERS, a Certified Shorthand  
3 Reporter of the State of California, and Registered  
4 Professional Reporter, do hereby certify:

5 That I am a disinterested person herein; that the  
6 foregoing California Integrated Waste Management Board,  
7 Market Development and Sustainability Committee meeting  
8 was reported in shorthand by me, James F. Peters, a  
9 Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California,  
10 and thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

11 I further certify that I am not of counsel or  
12 attorney for any of the parties to said meeting nor in any  
13 way interested in the outcome of said meeting.

14 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand  
15 this 19th day of November, 2008.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 JAMES F. PETERS, CSR, RPR

24 Certified Shorthand Reporter

25 License No. 10063

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

→